DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 211 201 PS 012 572

AUTHOR Porter, Carol J.
TITLE Professionalization and Day Care: Friend or Foe?
PUB DATE 13 Nov 81
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Conference on Child Care Education, University of Miami (Coral Gables, FL, November 13, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Certification; *Child Caregivers; *Day Care; Decentralization; Early Childhood Education; Federal Regulation; Financial Support; Government Role; Professional Development; *Professional Education; Professional Personnel; *Professional Recognition; State Aid
IDENTIFIERS *Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

The concept of day care service as a profession is discussed against the backdrop of decreased federal funding and increased federal emphasis on decentralization of government services. Because the public equates caring for other people's children with caring for one's own children, it is contended in this document that the issue of day care provision is particularly misunderstood, and that the public remains unconvinced that day care providers possess knowledge and skills not possessed by those outside the field. Professionalization of day care services is advocated as the means of best coping not only with the current federal suspicion of day care but also with the unsatisfactory working conditions experienced by day care workers. Eight characteristics of a profession are identified, and while professionalization of day care is advocated, the eight characteristics are also analyzed in terms of their use by opponents of day care. Realities of professionalization are discussed in terms of educational and service costs, resistance to standardization from within day care ranks, and sources of recognition for professionals. Recommendations regarding immediate steps to take include implementing informal networks of human services workers, becoming more involved in professional organizations, studying processes and efforts successfully used by business and industry to appeal to the public, and communicating with legislators. (Author/DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED211201

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PROFESSIONALIZATION AND DAY CARE:

FRIEND OR FOE?

Carol J. Porter

Department of Pediatrics and

Early Childhood Education

University of Pittsburgh

Child Development Unit

Children's Hospital Of Pittsburgh

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Carol J. Porter
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 012572

This paper was prepared as the Keynote address for the Conference on Child Care Education, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida. November 13, 1981.

PROFESSIONALIZATION AND DAY CARE: FRIEND OR FOE?

Carol J. Porter
University of Pittsburgh

A recent statement by President Reagan highlights the evolving child care crisis in this country: "Mothers and grandmothers have been taking care of children for thousands of years without special college training. Why is it that certain states prohibit anyone without a degree in early childhood education from operating a day care facility?" (President Reagan quoted in Time Magazine, October 19, 1981, p. 47).

It is now being proposed that Head Start, having survived relatively intact the first round of budget cuts, be restructured in ways that threaten its very existence. Although $950 million had originally been proposed for operating Head Start, that figure has been reduced to $832 million, a cut of 12%. In addition, whatever summer programs remain would be phased out, and parent/child programs would be converted to regular Head Start programs. The cost per child would be figured on a national mean rather than the individual state's costs. In turn, the reimbursement rate would be determined on a national average.

In addition, to these fiscal and program changes, the basic funding structure of the national Head Start program is being challenged. There is a move to consolidate contracts so that small grant programs will be hooked to larger grants. Technical assistance and training grants could be reduced from the present 350 contracts to 50, or one contract per state. The CDA training and credentialing process would be decentralized by being placed under state control. These consolidations are basically identical to what we have come to know as block grants where Federal resources are turned back to the states.

Another new direction of Head Start may be to increase volunteer efforts by including senior citizens, youth, and other organizations in Head Start programs.

As the Federal government lessens its involvement with Head Start through these various means, many problems arise. Whenever one consolidates or transfers power and control, the most salient issue becomes who gets the resulting power, control, and most importantly, resources, and who doesn't. Departments at the state level are likely to become the new enemy, new battles will begin, and it is unclear whether children's and families' needs will be able to supercede other, more political concerns. Head Start as it presently exists is not perfect, but Reagan's policy of decentralization may create more problems than we already have and the needs of our children and families are not likely to be tantamount in the decisions being made.

Politics of Professionalization

Although I could thank President Reagan for bringing attention to this topic, his statements and actions are much too tragic and damaging to make light of them. Not only is he changing the funding structure of day care in this country, he is trying very hard to change people's fundamental attitudes toward it. Originally, this topic concerned increased status for day care workers and now it is simply survival for day care workers.

There are people, even within the early childhood field, who confided that mothers and grandmothers might be cost-effective service providers. Most of the comments against his idea address the fact that most mothers and grandmothers are themselves already employed to meet the increased economic pressures on today's family. This point - that mothers and grandmothers are not available - is a very minor one. It is painful to see people within the field resorting to this kind of argument which also says, "If they were available, it might be a good idea." Instead, the argument must be: To care for one's own children is not the same thing as caring for other people's children. We have knowledge, skills

and abilities which reach beyond mothering, grandmothering, or babysitting. The questions which become most salient now are:

- How do we convince people that caring for our own children is different than caring for other people's children?

- How do we convince people that our ability to facilitate the development of children requires a body of knowledge and array of skills which we all have and others outside the field probably do not?

- And the question remains: Is professionalization the route which will best impact the disturbing events around us - which include not only wiping out professional day care altogether, but also include the conditions which we have endured throughout our history - low pay, high turnover, low status, long hours, all with little recognition of the role we play in society?

Block Grants

Let's take a brief look at the political system as it is evolving today and as it affects us in the field of early childhood services. By now, we are all familiar with the term block grant and what it means. Essentially, block grants take the Federal resources which had been available for different types of services and turn them over to the states. Thus, the states receive grants which fall into (as originally planned) five major categories: There would be block grants for health services, education, social services, energy assistance, and preventative health. These categories have since been expanded but the concept remains the same. After budget cuts, the funding for these categories has been reduced up to 60% in some cases (Sugarman, 1981). The programs which had taken place within these categories are, for funding purposes, combined. Thus, the competition for these limited funds is again quite open.

Legal mandates such as PL 94-142 which requires education for all children in the least restrictive environment remain, but the implementation of these long fought for laws remains questionable. The Federal guidelines as to how

the block grants must be used are very general, in keeping with the Reagan policy of handing control back to the states.

No one is against more localized power and decision making just as no one is for wasteful spending, increased bureaucracy, corruption, and graft. In concept, the idea is very palatable. The emphases on local decision making and the fight against waste and bureaucracy are all smoke screens for the real issue, or at least one of them: Without Federal regulation and with limited accountability, the up-for-grabs funding approach is likely to result in action addressed to majority rather than minority populations.

Federal responsibility for many of these areas came to be because some states refused, for whatever reason, to take responsibility for certain areas of need. When citizens have to decide between a swimming pool for their children at the local high school and special services for handicapped children, it becomes a difficult decision. It is all too easy to put our own needs above the needs of a specific minority population, whether it be disadvantaged, handicapped or abused. If the state's decisions do not uphold the rights and privileges of minority populations, the battles will have to begin all over again. Enforcement of already existing Federal mandates will come down to politics and money. The beliefs and persistence of the states and local communities will determine the future of our services. The very scary part of that is Reagan's attempt to alter beliefs which people in this country have about day care, as evidenced by his statements about volunteerism replacing trained workers.

Federal Day Care Regulations

We have an example of the effect of decentralization in day care already. The Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements have been written, received input from the professional and lay community, and are ready to go into effect. They remain in the bottom drawer: The Federal administration refuses to dictate minimum standards for child care in this country. The Federal regulations

are not asking for anything other than what we as professionals have indicated as a minimum level of adequacy. For example, the Federal standards would have required the equivalent of a CDA-type credential in order to work in a day care center which would assure, at the least, that people have been oriented to the field. It forces them to get a sense of kids and what they need. Without such pressure from the Federal government, we revert to state requirements. In Arizona, a day care worker needs to be 18 and of good moral character. In Iowa, one needs to have two credits of continuing education but can be 16 years old (Almy, 1981). Of course, such people might be fine day care workers but in this way, we are definitely relying on the luck of the draw.

Nature of Professionalization

How do we upgrade our field? How do we assure parents that our workers are well-trained capable, sensitive, mature adults? How do we as professionals deal with the substandard services which exist to some degree in every community? It is these questions among others which have motivated the professionalization movement in day care.

Professionalization is a term which is used often in our work with children and families. We all wish to be professional. We view our services as something above and beyond what our next-door neighbor could provide. Families expect us to be accountable, to have answers to questions and solutions to problems. We want our services to be recognized, acknowledged, and valued by society. We want other people to view our work as important. We are paid, therefore, we are professional. We want to be paid decent salaries, comparable to other professional service providers. We have special skills and knowledge necessary for providing quality care for children. We have all used the term professional in these and many other ways.

But let's look at the term professional more closely. Are we saying that day care or early childhood education should become a profession? Or, is it already? Many of us already identify with education --- and that's a profession,

isn't it? Yet, our paychecks and hours do not reflect the professional status which teachers enjoy.

The whole area of professions and professionalization is an academic area of study. Professions are seen as having distinct characteristics. We need to examine these closely to determine whether professionalization is what our field needs. We also need to determine whether there might be alternative models which would better fit our needs.

In looking at the nature of professionalization, I am going to discuss eight characteristics of a profession. The first time round, I am going to describe these characteristics in relation to day care and its potential benefits. But I ask you to leave room for the second time round when I will raise questions about how well these characteristics might serve our field.

1. <u>There is a recognized body of knowledge</u>. Most importantly, a profession has a generalized and systematic knowledge base which is shared by all members of the profession. This knowledge must be seen as fundamental to the provision of services encompassed by the field. According to authorities on professionalization, the nature of this knowledge base is supposed to be esoteric. The dictionary definition of esoteric is:

1) Intended for or understood by only a small group;

2) Difficult to understand;

3) Not publicly disclosed, or confidential.

The synonym given is mysterious.

In a recent survey we asked educators and administrators what caregivers need to know and be able to do. We received many different responses to this question (Klugman, 1980; Porter et. al, 1981). Much of the variation was dependent on the type of setting since we were surveying all types of child care including residential, hospital, and group homes. But even within day care, there was little agreement on what actually constituted the knowledge base.

This finding is not difficult to understand. Day care people need to know an awful lot of things! Many of us come from the early childhood education perspective. Although our formal education may have included many useful things, it might also have included reading instruction (although few pre-schoolers read), and other curriculum areas with little attention to the unique cognitive and social needs of young children. On the other hand, our formal education may not have included how to organize naptime, discipline unruly children, manage mealtimes, or structure activities which may include different types of children, including different ages, backgrounds, and abilities (including disabilities). We were probably not taught how to work with working parents who have demanding schedules, a multitude of responsibilities, and idiosyncractic child-rearing methods. Yet, no one would deny that these are essential skills for the day care workers.

It has been suggested and widely accepted that child development serves as the knowledge base of the child care field. This makes a lot of sense. If we know about children's development, we can probably manage all of the tasks in reasonable ways. We do not make unreasonable demands of children; we understand their viewpoint; and we intervene in ways which facilitate rather than hinder development. Using child development as our knowledge base, we can also easily learn to work with children in a variety of group settings.

2. <u>There is a recognized, needed service to the public</u>. A profession must serve the public and the public must see it as a needed service. Service is also defined as esoteric. In order to deliver this needed service, it is implied that we as professionals can be autonomous decision makers. Kamii (1981) has noted that we are not autonomous decision makers because we do not have a scientific base, changing our beliefs with the fads and fashion of the day. On a more practical level, she claims that we fail to achieve autonomy because we work in institutions which often make the decisions which by their nature, are vulnerable to political rather than scientific pressures.

With the changing patterns of family life and employment, it is easy to see how day care has become very much a part of the American scene of necessary human service. It is important to note, however, that it was external rather than internal forces which made us part of that scene. When greater numbers of mothers found themselves needing to go to work, our services became more crucial. No amount of our willing it to be so would have achieved the same goal.

3. The profession transmits the knowledge. This characteristic means that the profession itself is in charge of teaching its content and practice to those who want to learn it. The educational setting and content is prescribed by the profession who sets guidelines and standards for educational programs. Implicit in this approach is that the training period for those who wish to enter the profession is lengthy, usually five years or longer.

The great benefit of this aspect of professionalization is the possibility for the knowledge base to reflect the practitioner basis of the profession. We have a good tradition of people being involved in direct care of children and then moving into more indirect modes such as teaching, research, and writing. It is important that the people transmitting the knowledge base have practical experience as a foundation. By placing the power of transmission in the hands of the profession, this is more likely to occur. Indeed, in the teacher education guidelines now being developed by NAEYC, this has been a clear, strong mandate from the profession to the teacher educators.

4. The profession determines who gets access to the knowledge base through its training programs. Here we would see clear standards for entry into training programs. NAEYC struggled with this issue last week also. If we want to upgrade the quality of service, don't we need to have high standards for entrance into the training sequence? Other professions have an entry examination.

5. The profession determines who gets in to the profession. Once the training period is completed, there must be some form of controlled entry into the profession. This usually takes the form of licensing, certification, competency standards. Whatever the particular form, the entry is determined by the profession itself rather than any type of external regulation. Thus, the profession must have the ability to define and set standards.

6. The profession determines who stays in. Once in, the profession maintains control over who stays in and who does not. To do this, it requires a code of ethics and a system of enforcement. Here we address on one level the issue of substandard service. Professions kick people out, maybe not as often as they should but they have the power to do it through meaningful sanctions for self-policing. Enforcement, of course, implies more abundant resources for self-regulation.

7. The profession offers life-long career options. Another characteristic of a profession is that it is a field in which people can move and grow without leaving the field. We all now know of the phenomenon termed "burn-out." We need places to go when we "outgrow" a particular setting. There should be opportunities for both lateral and promotional moves. Day care workers should be able to move from direct service to children into more indirect lines of work such as advocacy, administration, teaching, and research if they wish. A broadened concept of child care would enable them to move into direct work with more varied populations after gaining the necessary specialized knowledge and skills.

We all know that day care workers tend to be young, female, underpaid, and overworked. In a recent study done in San Francisco by the Child Care Staff Education Project, 95 staff people working in child care centers were interviewed. Less than 25% viewed child care as a lifetime career. Half of the workers were under 30 years of age. In San Francisco, one of the country's most expensive cities, only 14% made $1,000 a month or more. The majority made less than $800

a month, and 57% were the sole wage earner in the family. At this point in time, workers tend to leave the field when they experience the personal and interpersonal stresses which result in burn-out. It would be nice if day care personnel were able to see more employment options for themselves without leaving the field. We are losing good people.

8. The profession provides the organizational structure for its activities. It is from this organization that members draw identification, support, and collaboration. This is the united front to the external forces which attempt to impinge on its purposes and rules. Professional organizations also help to clearly identify the leaders who can act for and guide the profession. It is also through this organization that many of the other characteristics are dealt with. For example, this organization can provide leadership in determining who gets trained, who gets in, and who stays in. As an organization, NAEYC recently took a major step toward dealing with some of these issues by introducing the idea of endorsement of early childhood centers.

Those are selected principles which characterize professionalization. It is easy to see some of the advantages which would benefit us both directly and indirectly by buying into this type of system. But let's take a brief whirl through them again, looking at some of the ways in which they may work against us.

1. The knowledge base. There are at least two problems with the characteristic knowledge base. The first is that it is difficult to agree on it without first deciding the scope of the child care field. A broadened concept of the field has captured the interest of many because it gives us two distinct advantages. One is personal because it gives individuals a wider array of career options without leaving the field. The second reason is political. In these times of financial scarcity and political conservatism, competition for resources within human services becomes self-defeating and depressing. Not only do we need cooperation among us, we need a stronger, larger political voice in influencing the distribution of resources in

the direction of services for children. While we remain undecided about the scope of our profession, it is impossible to decide about its knowledge base.

The second problem with the knowledge base is that it is supposed to be esoteric. Much of our effort as child care people goes into transmitting our knowledge base to parents and families. We want to share what we know. We want to make it easy to understand. And we want to demystify it without threatening its complexity or integrity. We have made substantial effort through parent education and family support networks to transmit the knowledge we have about facilitating development because we believe that such information should NOT be confidential. This attitude is clearly outside the realm of professionalism.

2. A needed service. Recently, we have been recognized as delivering a needed service. However, I remind you that food handlers, bus drivers, and crossing guards are also needed but have not been seen as professionals by our society. Simply being needed will not do it. In fact, it was Nixon who said that we were not needed because we undermined the nuclear family. Reagan can no longer say that we are unneeded but it is obvious that our services do not, for him, require special knowledge or skill. Here we might be more likely to be comfortable with the term esoteric. Putting the knowledge base, its translation into practice, the sensitivity and skills all together into one person does seem esoteric. It is a select group of people who are able to do it. Parents may not be able to translate the knowledge base which we share with them into quality service to a group of unrelated children.

Under this needed service category, however, is another problem for the early childhood field. The esoteric nature of service also implies that the professional decides what and how the service is delivered. In our field, we have worked hard to have some degree of partnership with parents in designing our programs and policies and in responding to individual children. In this sense, we have been ahead of the professionalization game. The consumer movement has drastically changed the nature of the professional/client relationship. We as consumers are now taking a more active role in decisions

about our medical care and our legal assistance. We, as early childhood people, struggle to find the right balance between client input and professional decisions. Other professions are just beginning this dialogue, and we can witness how difficult it is for lofty professionals to surrender their pedestals.

3. Transmitters of knowledge. Rarely do non-medical people write about medical topics. Rarely do people outside the legal profession write about law. However, the whole world writes about child development and child care. Everyone is an expert by virtue of having been one or perhaps having raised one. Not only can we not keep the knowledge base to ourselves, it seems that it would be extremely difficult to control who transmits it and who their audience is.

Do we really consider ourselves experts? As long as our knowledge base admits common sense and intuition as scientific evidence, we cannot regard ourselves as possessing a unique, unshared, knowledge base. Nor can we control how it, whatever it is, gets transmitted.

Another problem arises with the length of training. Are we willing to say that entry at the professional level requires something like 5 years? If we view the B.A. degree as a professional degree, then we are probably comfortable with this concept. Do we view people with associate degrees as para-professionals?

4. Access to training. There were two viewpoints represented at the NAEYC Teacher Education Guidelines hearing last week. One group felt that our admissions had to be open and inclusive to encourage all potential candidates. Another group felt that to upgrade our field, we needed to restrict admissions to only the candidates showing greatest promise and ability. Implicit in the open admissions policy is the ability to provide remedial services for deficits. Others suggested an admission test. The ramifications of this issue are extremely pertinent to early childhood. At this point in our country, a restricted admissions policy would not result in a representative cultural diversity among candidates. Those who have had less advantage in their own schooling would be more likely to fail stringent admission standards. How to

deal with this issue is a puzzlement to many since some educational settings do not have the resources to supplement their regular curriculum in the needed areas.

5. Controlled entry to the profession. To control entry to the profession, we need some type of standard which is enforceable. CDA has worked long and hard at this. Ironically, despite its efforts, CDA would not qualify as a professional credential under the standards which we have discussed here. Licensing is another way. We all know cases of workers who do not have the credentials but perhaps deserve to be in the professional ranks. We seem to get hung up on these people, citing the exception rather than the rule. How do we admit that there will always be exceptions but we need to deal with a set of guidelines, not specific cases? Can and should we become more stringent?

6. Self-regulation of the profession. Eventually, it seems that we need to face the issue of weeding out incompetent caregivers. We are trained to appreciate the worth and preciousness of other people. We are not well trained in giving feedback, especially negative feedback. We are certainly unprepared for kicking out the bad eggs. Is it likely that we, as a profession, could manage this task?

7. Life-long career options. Having hierarchical markers in professional development means that there must exist an overall, obvious status structure. Without such a structure, the markers lack meaning. To create this structure, child care needs to admit faculty, researchers, authors and others who do not work with children. I know there may be resistance to this concept.

Again, the proposed teacher education guidelines are specific about direct-line work. "Faculty members have had a minimum of three years of experience with (each of) the age groups to be served by the program graduates." And moreover, "Faculty members must have successful teaching experiences with children in the appropriate age group within the last five years, or have maintained current contact with practice through regular observation and

supervision of field experience" (NAEYC, 1981). Are these standards meant to keep the practitioner basis of our field visible, as we discussed before, or are they possibly indications of our reluctance to deal with a status structure?

8. Organizational structure. The question about professional organization comes down quite simply to the question: which one? We all have an idea about the organization most visible to each of us but there are literally hundreds of organizations which deal with children; many would like to take over the profession. Turf issues are very serious ones because they seem impossible to resolve. This issue is extremely pervasive, underlying every other argument. Our ability to look beyond our own worlds sometimes casts doubts on our supposed progression out of the preoperational stage of cognitive development.

The other fact of the matter is that our organizations, whichever one or ones they are, may have occasionally failed us. In some major or minor way, they fail to meet our individual needs and we abandon them, if in fact we ever joined them. And let us not overlook the cost of professional membership dues.

After this second glance at the nature of professionalization and its relation to our field, perhaps we have developed a healthy skepticism for relying on professionalization to solve our woes. If the professionalization process does not offer us a panacea, what does?

The Realities of Professionalization

The realities of professionalization reach beyond whether or not we can fit the characteristics of a profession to ourselves.

Costs

An overwhelming reality at this point is the cost of professionalization. As we require our workers to undergo lengthy training periods, we increase the cost of their services. Already, families are strapped to meet the finances of child care. I would suspect that most consumers would not want to drastically

increase their child care costs in order to obtain more professional care. Again, we are dealing with attitudes which are shaped by powers beyond our immediate influence. We know that child care programs are chosen for their hours, location, and cost more than the considerations of staff or program. Only if staff and programming really fall short to the untrained eye, are consumers likely to put aside their more logistical concerns.

For workers who do decide to enter the higher educational system, they are entering a system which itself is in crisis. Most tuition is out of reach for the average family now, and colleges and universities are actively struggling to find ways to support themselves. Programs are being cut.

Educational programs are cut for financial reasons but they are also cut for philosophical reasons. And on this count, child care does not always fare well. Programs are periodically threatened with annihilation, despite the fact that they continue to attract large amounts of students and hold their own financially. Some administrators believe that day care does not require a special knowledge base or skill base and in fact, could be done by volunteers. Again, it is attitudes which are holding back professionalization.

Students who put out considerable financial resources to get their education and training expect to be comparably rewarded when entering professional work. Most people beginning work in a day care center can barely afford to live on their salaries, let along pay back student loans, let alone feel good (financially) about themselves.

The political system in which we find ourselves probably cannot financially support professionalization of day care, either on the higher education scene or in terms of salaries for beginning or advanced workers.

The Concept of Craftmanship

Professionalization is also resisted from within our ranks by a resistance to standardization of our work. So much of our work depends on the practitioner's interpersonal sensitivity, style, and effectiveness. Some see professionalization

as downplaying these more personal, aesthetic aspects of our work with children.

Recently, Beker and Eisikovits (1981) have responded to this concern with the interesting concept of craftmanship, described as the relationship between the work, and the content and methods of the work. Although professionalization offers the structural components needed to upgrade the status and quality of our work, the concept of craft pays close attention to the idiosyncratic subtleties of our work.

Leaders in our field have played around with the dichotomy in early childhood education: Is it a science? Is it an art? Craft differs from art in that its product is a practical one rather than a purely aesthetic one. At the same time, the craft ideal is that each product is a little different. The contrasting commercial idea is that each product is the same and interchangeable.

Our products in early childhood settings emerge from the interactions between adults, children, and their environment. Our tasks are defined as much by the dynamic, often unpredictable responses of children and their parents as they are by our own expertise. Our responses, however, are not random or unsystematic. On the contrary, we are grounded in the professional perspective of a shared body of knowledge and skills.

This concept of craftsmanship is an attractive one. It conceptualizes many of the "soft" areas of our discipline which seem resistant to professionalization. It is a familiar concept to all and easily understood. It does not deny our attempts to elevate ourselves in society, whether it is by professionalization or some other means, but it captures some of the missing parts in the rather hard-nosed discussions of professionalization. It takes care of our staff who are exceptional caregivers without formal education. There are such craftspeople, however, they usually find that they must at some point in their careers seek further training and techniques.

Sources of Recognition

The most important point concerns the source of recognition. Professionalization happens because society sees the occupation as a profession, not simply because we want it to be. Some occupations claim prestige for themselves and no one really objects because there is no competition for its regulation. In some ways, this is what the traffic controllers have been going through. They were telling us that they experienced the stresses and pressures of making the autonomous decisions of a professional. They had undergone a relatively lengthy training process. Their daily tasks required more than a cookbook response. The response which the government made to them is interesting. Not only did they say that we can survive with fewer of them, but also we could shorten the training period to a matter of months and produce more, equally competent, of them. I think President Reagan was saying to them: You are not a profession, you are an occupation. You can be replaced.

President Reagan's message to us seems equally clear. Not only are we not a profession, we are not even an occupation. Our work can be done without any training and need not be paid for. President Reagan is not speaking to us only as child care workers, he is also saying something about women's traditional work, of mothering and grandmothering. Caring for children, whether it is by related or unrelated caregivers, seems to be reverting, in its extreme form, to a biological endowment of women, and in its less extreme form, to cheerful, altruistic volunteerism.

Our country has taken a giant step backwards. Although day care services are now seen as necessary, we as early childhood trained professionals are not seen as the most capable authority. Absolutely nothing will happen until our own leaders and organizations are regarded as the source of authority. Simply wishing it so will not make it happen.

What now?

This message has not been especially cheery. We need to think about impacting the system on two levels, within our ranks and to the outside world.

Among ourselves, we need to begin informal networking across the spectrum of human services. Pitting the concerns of the elderly, for example, against the concerns of children will get us nowhere. We need to learn more about the similarities among us so that we can find more common ground for support and identity. On a local level, it can increase our voice multifold when we join rather than fight other human services, especially those concerned with children.

We also need to become more involved in the formal organizations which already exist in our field. Most of them have already made some inroads into the political system. We need to look at them as fighting the bigger battle rather than satisfying our own personal, professional needs.

To the outside world, we need to present a unified front. To learn how to do this, we should look at those groups which have been unsuccessful. Look outside of human services; we're relatively lousy at this game. Look at business and industry. What they do that is different is appeal to economic values rather than human values. Let's quit the bleeding heart club and join the ranks of cost-effectiveness. We would much rather use pleas which appeal to an appreciation of human beings. But, let's face it; they don't work anymore.

Of course, we need to communicate with our lawmakers. We can send copies of things which cross our desks. Keep a supply of stamped postcards by the TV set so when the mood strikes, you can strike. If possible, appeal from your citizen or parent status rather than professional status. They are less likely to see your remarks as self-serving. Letters do get counted and they are presently runnning about 10 to 1 in favor of administration policy.

Summary

In summary, we must conclude that professionalization is a complex issue. Some parts of professionalization could obviously help us; other parts may threaten some of the unique foundations of our field. The concept of craftsmandship may help us understand better what we want to but may not help us achieve what we want. Viewing our work as a craft built upon the structure of a profession may be the most compatible reconciliation between the pros and cons of professionalization.

Recognition for the value and quality of our work must come from the outside, not from within our own ranks. When we look outside, we see the bridges we had built over the last two decades crumbling. Let's join in rebuilding them, even if, as professionals, we need to start from the other side of the river.

References

Almy, M. Education and training for day care: Implications for child care education. Child Care Quarterly, 1981, 10 (3), 226-241.

Beker, J. Professionalization in child care and the content of the work: Some new perspectives. Paper presented at the Eleventh Annual Conference on Professional Practice of the Child Care Workers Association of Ontario, Toronto, October 1981.

Kamii, C. Teacher's autonomy and scientific training. Young Children, 1981, 36 (4), 5-17.

Klugman, E. Analysis of survey results: Tasks and competencies for child care workers. Paper presented at the initial conference of the Conference-Research Sequence in Child Care Education, Pittsburgh, PA, November 1980.

Porter, C. J.; VanderVen, K.; and Mattingly, M. A. (Eds). Perspectives on Educating for Child and Youth Care Practice. University of Pittsburgh, 1981.

Sugarman, J. M. Human services in the 1980's: A white paper for citizens and government officials. McLean, VA, July, 1981.